

November 19, 2024

Hon. Analise Torres  
United State District Court, S.D.N.Y.  
500 Pearl Street, Courtroom 17D  
New York, NY 10007  
RE: denial of sanctions motion as premature

Your Honor,

I am the *pro-se* Plaintiff in the above-mentioned matter, hereinafter referred to in first person or as “Plaintiff.” On November 18, 2024, I filed a Motion for Sanctions against Eric Trump and counsel, given that their severe misrepresentation in their August 15<sup>th</sup> Opposition letter (in which they opposed Eric Trump being added as a defendant) led Magistrate Judge Parker to commit error and deny the addition of Mr. Trump. I filed a Motion for Reconsideration, which Your Honor ‘entered’ and stated you would treat as a Rule 72a Objection and rule on it yourself. **That matter is currently pending before Your Honor, not before Magistrate Judge Parker.**

This morning, Magistrate Judge Parker entered an Order (#478) denying my Motion for Sanctions as premature. It reads: “*Plaintiff’s motion for sanctions at ECF No. 477 is denied without prejudice as premature. In accordance with the undersigned’s Individual Rules, Plaintiff is directed to file a letter seeking a pre-motion conference before filing a motion for sanctions.*”

I believe this is incorrect. As a pro-se litigant, per Your Honor’s Individual Rules, I am *not* to file a pre-motion letter first. (“**Pre-Motion Conferences. Pre-motion conferences and pre-motion letters are not required in *pro se* cases.**”)

Moreover, this particular issue in the case is pending before *Your Honor* (Hon. Analise Torres) and it is entirely unclear why Magistrate Judge Parker opted to step in.

I respectfully request that my Motion for Sanctions be reinstated.

**Second**, I, with respect to Magistrate Judge Parker, implore that no further matters/issued be referred to Magistrate Judge Parker. Magistrate Judge Parker was due to preside over discovery and that has concluded. Defendants are happy to have Magistrate Judge Parker endlessly continue to rule, as she rules in favor of Defendants 90% of the time. I believe I have a right for the Article 3 judge to preside over matters. *Additionally*, this ‘back and forth’ (in which it is unclear whether Your Honor or Judge Parker is presiding over a matter) has led to extreme confusion – e.g., twice now, Defendants have had to ask the Court when, exactly, a response to a motion is due, because they are unclear as to whether to proceed under Your Honor’s Rules or Magistrate Judge Parker’s Rules. Discovery has concluded, as Magistrate Judge Parker repeatedly reminds me. As such, her role in this case should, respectfully, also conclude.

Respectfully and humbly submitted,  
s/ Arlene Delgado  
Plaintiff, *pro-se*